# STATE OF ARIZONA FILED

JUN 12 2015

STATE OF ARIZONA

CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE

Respondent

DEPT OF INSURANCE
BY

DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE

3

1

2

4

In the Matter of:

COMPANY,

NAIC # 62308,

5

6

7

9

10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

Order").

23

24

25

Docket No. 15A-054-INS

**CONSENT ORDER** 

targeted market conduct examination of Connecticut General Life Insurance Company ("the Company"). The Report of Targeted Examination of Connecticut General Life Insurance Company, dated as of December 31, 2010, ("the Report") alleges that the Company has violated Arizona Revised Statutes ("A.R.S.") §§ 20-444(A), 20-448(B), 20-461(A)(1), (3), (5), and (15), 20-1110(E), 20-2106(7)(a) and (8)(b), 20-2104(B)(2), 20-2110(A) and (B), 20-2309(A), 20-2533(D), 20-2534(B), 20-2535(F), 20-2536(G), 20-2537(C), and 20-3102(A) and Arizona Administrative Code ("A.A.C.") R20-6-201(C)(2), (C)(3), (C)(7), (C)(9), (D), (E)(1) (I), and (O), R20-6-201.01, R20-6-801(D)(1), (F), and (G)(1)(a), and three prior consent orders: Consent Order, Docket No. 01A-244-INS

Examiners for the Department of Insurance ("the Department") conducted a

The Company wishes to resolve this matter without formal proceedings, admits the following Findings of Fact are true and consents to the entry of the following Conclusions of Law and Order.

("the 2001 Consent Order"), Consent Order, Docket No. 04A-175-INS ("the 2004

Consent Order"), and Consent Order, Docket No. 08A-156-INS ("the 2008 Consent

1.3

# FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Company is domiciled in Connecticut and is authorized to transact life and disability insurance in Arizona pursuant to a Certificate of Authority issued by the Director.
- 2. The Director authorized the Examiners to conduct a targeted market conduct examination of the Company. The examination covered the time period from January 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010, and was concluded on November 7, 2013. Based on the examination findings, the Examiners prepared the Report, dated December 31, 2010.
- The Company failed to file with the Department advertisements related to its various group and individual lines of business prior to their use.
- 4. The Company failed to maintain all advertising pieces, along with notations and supporting documents, for at least three years from the date of dissemination.
- 5. The Company used marketing materials, advertising and sales scripts that:
- a. Failed to identify policy exclusions and limitations for specific benefits referenced in the advertising, including exclusions for preexisting conditions;
- b. Included policy exclusions, reductions and limitation in fine print and separately located from the description of benefits;
- c. Made unsupported and undocumented statements regarding policy benefits, claims handling, and/or the Company's relative position in the insurance industry; and
- d. Used "testimonial" advertising without being able to produce the name of the author or the full text of the testimonial.

- 6. The Company unfairly discriminated among individuals of essentially the same hazard in the benefits payable or in the application of the terms or conditions of coverage by failing to offer Individual medical insurance to persons who are older than 64½ years old as of the effective date of coverage.
- 7. The Company issued renewal letters to employers that failed to include an explanation of the extent to which any increase in premium was due to the actual or expected experience of the individuals covered under the plan.
- 8. The Company used application forms for health insurance coverage that failed to limit the disclosure authorization for this information to not more than 30 months.
- 9. The Company used application forms for coverage other than health insurance that contained a disclosure authorization for information collected in connection with claims for benefits that did not limit the effectiveness of the disclosure authorization to the duration of the claim.
- 10. The Company failed to send the required Notice of Insurance Information Practices at least annually in the case of policy renewals.
- 11. The Company used letters to notify proposed insureds for Individual insurance coverage of an adverse underwriting decision, which letters did not allow 90 days to request additional information and/or appeal the adverse underwriting decision.
- 12. The Company failed to provide a Summary of Rights to all applicants at the time the adverse underwriting decision was communicated.
  - 13. During the processing of claims for Arizona residents, the Company:
- a. Misrepresented and/or failed to fully disclose benefits payable under the policy;

- b. Failed to perform a reasonable investigation before denying claims submitted by both insureds and/or providers;
- c. Failed to adjudicate claims received from providers within 30 days of receipt of a clean claim; and
- d. Failed promptly to provide a reasonable explanation of the basis in the insurance policy relative to the facts or applicable law for the denial of claims.
  - 14. With regard to appeal forms and procedures, the Company:
- a. Used an acknowledgment letter for an Expedited Medical Review that indicated an incorrect time frame for reaching a determination;
- b. Misstated Arizona appeal rights in Explanation of Benefits ("EOB") and other pertinent claim documents in use during the examination period;
- c. Failed to provide members with an EOB or any other notice of a denied claim that included a notice of the right to appeal the denial;
- d. Failed at the conclusion of an Informal Reconsideration to advise the member of the right to proceed after the formal review to an External Independent Review;
- e. Failed at the conclusion of a Formal Appeal to advise the member of the right to proceed to an External Independent Review;
- f. Failed to provide the criteria used and clinical reasons for Formal Appeal decisions; and
- g. Failed to forward requests for External Independent Reviews to the Department within five business days after receipt of the request.

# **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-1110(E) by failing to file its advertising with the Department prior to their use.

2.

advertising, along with notations and supporting documents, for at least three years.

3. The Company violated A.R.S. §§ 20-444 and 20-461(A)(17) and A.A.C. R20-6-201 by using noncomplying marketing materials, advertising, and sales scripts

The Company violated A.A.C. R20-6-201.01(C) by failing to maintain its

- R20-6-201 by using noncomplying marketing materials, advertising, and sales scripts that failed to provide required information, misstated benefits, and/or made unsubstantiated claims about the Company's products, operations, and/or relative strength and experience.
- 4. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-448(B) by unfairly discriminating among individuals of essentially the same hazard, in the benefits payable or in the application of the terms or conditions of coverage.
- 5. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2309(A) and the 2004 Consent Order by issuing renewal letters to employers that failed to include an explanation extent to which any increase in premium was due to the actual or expected experience of the individuals covered under the plan;
- 6. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2106 by using disclosure authorization forms that failed to meet the statutory requirements regarding time limits for effectiveness for release of information.
- 7. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2104(B)(2) by failing to provide the Notice of Insurance Information at least annually in the case of policy renewals.
- 8. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2110(B) by using letters to notify proposed insureds for Individual insurance coverage of an adverse underwriting decision, which letters did not allow 90 days to request additional information and/or appeal the adverse underwriting decision.

- 9. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2110(A) by failing to provide a Summary of Rights to all applicants at the time an adverse underwriting decision was communicated.
- 10. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-461(A)(1) and A.A.C. R20-6-801(D)(1) by misrepresenting and/or failing to fully disclose benefits payable under the policy.
- 11. The Company violated A.R.S. §§ 20-461(A)(3) and (4) and 20-3102(B), A.A.C. R20-6-801(F), and the 2008 Consent Order by failing to perform a timely and reasonable investigation of claims prior to denying the claim.
- 12. The Company violated A.R.S. §§ 20-461(A)(5) and 20-3102(A) by failing to adjudicate claims submitted by and paid to providers within 30 days of receipt of a clean claim.
- 13. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-461(A)(15) and A.A.C. R20-6-801(G)(1)(a) by failing to provide a reasonable explanation relative to the facts and applicable law for the denials of claims.
- 14. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2534(B) by using an acknowledgment letter for an Expedited Medical Review that indicated an incorrect time frame for reaching a determination.
- 15. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2533(D) by misstating the Arizona appeal rights on EOB forms and in other notices to insureds.
- 16. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2533(D) by failing to provide members with an EOB or any other notice of a denied claim that included a notice of the right to appeal the denial.
- 17. The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2535(F), the 2001 Consent Order, and the 2004 Consent Order by failing at the conclusion of an Informal Reconsideration

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

25

24

to advise the member of the right to proceed after the formal review to an external independent review.

- The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2536(G) by failing at the conclusion of 18. a Formal Appeal to advise the member of the right to proceed to an external independent review.
- The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2536(E)(2), the 2001 Consent Order, 19. and the 2008 Consent Order by failing to provide the criteria used and clinical reasons for a Formal Appeal decision.
- The Company violated A.R.S. § 20-2537(C) by failing to forward requests 20. for External Independent Review to the Department within five business days after receipt of the request.
- Grounds exist for the entry of the following Order in accordance with 21. A.R.S. §§ 20-220, 20-456, 20-2117, and 20-2508.

### ORDER

# IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- Connecticut General Life Insurance Company shall: 1.
- a. Include in all renewal letters for employers the extent to which any increase in premium was due to the actual or expected experience of the individuals covered under the plan.
- b. Use disclosure authorization forms that contain the statutorily required time limits for release of information.
- c. Provides a Notice of Insurance Information to insureds at least annually in the case of policy renewals.

8

- d. Use letters to notify proposed insureds of an adverse underwriting decision, allowing 90 days to request additional information and/or appeal the adverse underwriting decision.
- e. Perform a timely and reasonable investigation of claims submitted by insureds or providers prior to denying the claim.
- f. Adjudicate all claims in a timely manner in accordance with regulatory standards.
- g. Provide a reasonable explanation for the denial of claims in sufficient detail, relative to the facts or applicable law, to allow members and providers to appeal the adverse decision.
- h. Provide accurate notification in all appeals correspondence as to the time frames for resolution of the appeal.
- i. Correct all EOB and other pertinent claim forms to accurately describe the Arizona appeal rights.
- j. Issue to members an EOB or other notice of the denial of a claim that includes the notice of the right to appeal the denial.
- k. Provide the required notice at the conclusion of each level of appeal that the member has the right to proceed to an External Independent Review at the conclusion of a Formal Appeal.
  - I. Provide the criteria used and clinical reasons for all appeal decisions.
- m. Forward requests for External Independent Review to the Department within five business days after receipt of the request.
- Within 90 days of the filed date of this Order, the Company shall submit to 2. the Arizona Department of Insurance, for approval, evidence that corrections have been implemented and communicated to the appropriate personnel, regarding all of the

items listed above in Paragraph 1 of the Order section of this Consent Order. Evidence of corrective action includes but is not limited to memos, bulletins, emails, correspondence, procedures manuals, print screens and training materials.

- 3. The Department shall be permitted, through authorized representatives, to verify that the Company has complied with all provisions of this Order.
- 4. The Company shall pay a civil penalty of \$235,750.00 to the Director for deposit in the State General Fund in accordance with A.R.S. § 20-220(B). This civil penalty shall be provided to the Market Conduct Examinations Section of the Department prior to the filing of this Order.
- 5. The Report of Examination of the Market Conduct Affairs of Connecticut General Life Insurance Company dated December 31, 2010, including the letter submitted in response to the Report of Examination, shall be filed with the Department after the Director has filed this Order.

naine L. Mark

DATED in Arizona this  $11^{\frac{1}{2}}$  day of  $\frac{1}{2}$  day of  $\frac{1}{2}$  2015.

Germaine L. Marks Director of Insurance

:0 || . .

21 || ' '

|| Dat

## **CONSENT TO ORDER**

- Connecticut General Life Insurance Company has reviewed the foregoing
   Order.
- 2. Connecticut General Life Insurance Company admits the jurisdiction of the Director of Insurance, State of Arizona, admits the foregoing Findings of Fact, and consents to the entry of the Conclusions of Law and Order.
- 3. Connecticut General Life Insurance Company is aware of its right to a hearing, at which it may be represented by counsel, present evidence, and cross-examine witnesses. Connecticut General Life Insurance Company irrevocably waives its right to such notice and hearing and to any court appeals related to this Order.
- 4. Connecticut General Life Insurance Company states that no promise of any kind or nature whatsoever was made to it to induce it to enter into this Order and that it has entered into this Consent Order voluntarily.
- 5. Connecticut General Life Insurance Company acknowledges that the acceptance of this Order by the Director of Insurance, State of Arizona, is solely to settle this matter against it and does not preclude any other agency or officer of this state or its subdivisions or any other person from any other civil or criminal proceedings, whether civil, criminal, or administrative, as may be appropriate now or in the future.

۸.	6.	Edward Kim						office	
/ice. Presid	dent :	and General Manager_	of Connecticut	Gen	eral Life	e Insura	nce C	ompany,	is
autho	rized	to enter into this Order	for it and on its	beha	alf.				

CONNECTION GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

By: Land

1	COPY of the foregoing mailed/delivered					
2	this <u>12th</u> day of <u>June</u> , 2015, to:					
3	Germaine L. Marks Director of Insurance Darren Ellingson					
4						
5	Deputy Director Director's Office					
6	Yvonne R. Hunter Assistant Director					
7	Consumer Affairs Division  Kurt Regner					
8	Assistant Director Financial Affairs Division					
9	David Lee Chief Financial Examiner					
10	Erin Klug Assistant Director Rate & Form Division					
11						
12	Chuck Gregory Special Agent Supervisor					
13	Investigations Division Helene I. Tomme					
14	Market Examinations Supervisor  Market Oversight Division					
15	Markot Storage 2					
16	DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE					
17	2910 North 44th Street, Suite 210 Phoenix, AZ 85018					
18						
19	Nancy B. Bucklin, Esq.					
20	Cigna HealthCare Legal Department 5310 East High Street Suite 200					
21						
22	Phoenix, Arizona 85054					
23						
24	Maidene Scheiner					